

SOME CONSTRAINTS ON FROBENIUS MANIFOLDS WITH A TT^* -STRUCTURE

JIEZHU LIN

ABSTRACT. The article gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a Frobenius manifold to be a CDV-structure. We show that there exists a positive definite CDV-structure on any semi-simple Frobenius manifold. We also compare three natural connections on a CDV-structure and conclude that the underlying Hermitian manifold of a non-trivial CDV-structure is not a Kähler manifold. Finally, we compute the harmonic potential of a harmonic Frobenius manifolds.

0. INTRODUCTION

Cecotti and Vafa [1] [4] considered moduli spaces of $N = 2$ supersymmetric quantum field theories and introduced a geometry on them which is governed by the tt^* -equations. By the work of K. Saito and M. Saito, it was previously known that the base space of a semi-universal unfolding of a hypersurface singularity can be equipped with the structure of what is now called a Frobenius manifold, after [5]. By the work of Cecotti and Vafa it can be equipped with tt^* geometry if the singularity is quasi-homogeneous. tt^* geometry generalizes the notion of variation of Hodge structures. Inspired by the papers [5], [1] and [4], C. Hertling combines these two structures together into a structure which he calls a *CDV-structure*.

The purpose of the first part of this article is to give a necessary and sufficient condition for a Frobenius manifold to be a CDV-structure. This condition plays an important role in constructing examples of CDV-structures, and in the existence CDV-structures on any semi-simple Frobenius manifold. The purpose of the second part of this article is to compare three natural connections on a CDV-structure and conclude that the real structure κ cannot be flat and the underlying real $(1,1)$ -form of a nontrivial semi-simple CDV-structure can not be a symplectic form. In particular, the underlying Hermitian manifold

Key words and phrases. Frobenius manifold, Saito structure, tt^* -geometry, CDV-structure, harmonic Frobenius manifold.

The author thanks CMLS of Ecole Polytechnique in Palaiseau for good working condition during her visit in May 2008, and especially professor Claude Sabbah for his invitation, hospitality and enlightening conversations. Her work is partly supported by NKBRPC(2006CB805905), CMLS of Ecole Polytechnique and DMA of Ecole Normale supérieure.

of a nontrivial semi-simple positive CDV-structure cannot be a Kähler manifold.

Acknowledgement. The author is grateful to professor Claude Sabbah for pointing me to the work of Claus Hertling, and for his patient helps, encouragements, valuable suggestions and fruitful discussions. She also expresses her gratitude to professor Juanxun Hu for his patient helps, valuable suggestions and encouragements.

1. FROBENIUS MANIFOLD AND TT^* GEOMETRY

In this section we recall the notion of a Frobenius manifold and CDV-structure. This will mainly serve to fix notation.

1.1. Saito structure and Frobenius manifold structure. Frobenius manifolds were introduced and investigated by B. Dubrovin as the axiomatization of a part of the rich mathematical structure of the Topological Field Theory (TFT): cf. [6, 7, 9]

A Frobenius manifold (also called Frobenius structure on M) is a quadruple $(M, \circ, g, e, \mathcal{E})$. Here M is a manifold in one of the standard categories (C^∞ , analytic, ...), g is a metric on M (that is, a symmetric, non-degenerate bilinear form, also denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$), $\circ$ is a commutative and associative product on T_M and depends smoothly on M , such that if ∇ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of g , all subject to the following conditions:

- a) ∇ is flat;
- b) $g(X \circ Y, Z) = g(X, Y \circ Z)$, for any $X, Y, Z \in TM$.
- c) the unit vector field e is covariant constant w.r.t. ∇

$$\nabla e = 0;$$

- d) Let

$$c(X, Y, Z) := g(X \circ Y, Z)$$

(a symmetric 3-tensor). We require the 4-tensor

$$(\nabla_Z c)(U, V, W)$$

to be symmetric in the four vector fields U, V, W, Z .

- e) A vector field $\mathcal{E}$ must be determined on M such that

$$(1.1) \quad \nabla(\nabla \mathcal{E}) = 0;$$

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(\circ) = \circ;$$

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g) = D \cdot g.$$

Remark 1.4. In this definition, because the metric g is flat and the unit field e is covariant constant w.r.t. ∇ , then (1.3) implies (1.1).

Good reference is the last chapter in [10].

There are several equivalent ways to describe a Frobenius structure. One way, called Saito structure, is recalled here:

Definition 1.5. Let M be a complex analytic manifold of dimension m . A Saito structure on M (without metric) consists of the following data:

- 1) a flat torsion free connection ∇ on the tangent bundle $\mathcal{T}_M$;
- 2) a symmetric Higgs field Φ on the tangent bundle $\mathcal{T}_M$, that is, Φ is an $\mathcal{O}_M$ -linear map $\Phi: \Theta_M \rightarrow \Omega_M^1 \otimes \Theta_M$ such that

$$\Phi_X \Phi_Y = \Phi_Y \Phi_X;$$

- 3) two global sections (vector fields) e and $\mathcal{E}$ of Θ_M , respectively called unit field and Euler field of the structure.

These data are subject to the following conditions:

- a) the meromorphic connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ on the bundle $\pi^*\mathcal{T}_M$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times M$ defined by the formula

$$\tilde{\nabla} = \pi^*\nabla + \frac{\pi^*\Phi}{z} - \left(\frac{\Phi(\mathcal{E})}{z} + \nabla\mathcal{E} \right) \frac{dz}{z}$$

is integrable;

- b) the field e is ∇ -horizontal (i.e., $\nabla e = 0$) and satisfies $\Phi_e = -\text{Id}$ (i.e., the product $\circ$ associated to Φ has e as a unit field).

Definition 1.6. Let M be a complex analytic manifold of dimension m . A Saito structure on M with metric consists of a Saito structure $(\nabla, \Phi, e, \mathcal{E})$ and of a metric g on the tangent bundle, satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $\nabla g = 0$ (hence ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g);
- (2) $\Phi^* = \Phi$, i.e., for any local section X of Θ_M , $\Phi_X^* = \Phi_X$, where $*$ denotes the adjoint w.r.t. g ;
- (3) there exists a complex number $d \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\nabla\mathcal{E} + (\nabla\mathcal{E})^* = (2 - d) \cdot \text{Id};$$

Proposition 1.7 ([6, 10]). *On any manifold M , there is an equivalence between a Saito structure with metric and a Frobenius structure.*

Locally, given a Frobenius manifold structure on open subset $U \subset \mathbb{C}^m$, then we can find a function $F = F(t)$, $t = (t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m)$, such that its third derivatives

$$C_{ijk} := \frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial t^i \partial t^j \partial t^k}$$

satisfy the following equations

- 1) Normalization:

$$g_{ij} := C_{1ij}$$

is a constant non-degenerate matrix. Let

$$(g^{ij}) := (g_{ij})^{-1}$$

2) Associativity: the functions

$$C_{ij}{}^k := \sum_l C_{ijl} \cdot g^{lk}$$

define a commutative and associative algebra on $T_t M$ by

$$\partial_{t^i} \circ \partial_{t^j} := \sum_k C_{ij}{}^k \partial_{t^k}$$

3) Homogeneity: The function F must be quasi-homogeneous, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}} F = d_F \cdot F + \text{quadratic terms},$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \sum_{i,j} (q_i^j t^i + r^j) \partial_{t^j}$, and $d_F \in \mathbb{C}$.

If the eigenvalues of $\nabla \mathcal{E}$ are simple, then the Euler vector field can be reduced to the form

$$\mathcal{E} = \sum_i d_i t^i \partial_{t^i} + \sum_{j|d_j=0} r_j \partial_{t^j}.$$

where all r_j are complex numbers, and all d_i are the eigenvalues of $\nabla \mathcal{E}$. Moreover, if $g(e, e) = 0$, we have

Proposition 1.8 ([6]). *Let M be a Frobenius manifold. Assume that $g(e, e) = 0$ and that the eigenvalues of $\nabla \mathcal{E}$ are simple. Then by a linear change of coordinates t_i the matrix g_{ij} can be reduced to the anti-diagonal form*

$$(1.9) \quad g_{ij} = \delta_{i+j, m+1};$$

$$(1.10) \quad e = \partial_{t^1}.$$

and in these coordinates

$$(1.11) \quad F(t) = \frac{1}{2}(t^1)^2 t^m + \frac{1}{2}(t^1)^2 \sum_i t^i t^{m-i+1} + f(t^2, t^3, \dots, t^m).$$

for some function, the sum

$$d_i + d_{m-i+1}$$

does not depend on i , and

$$d_F = 2d_1 + d_m.$$

If the degrees are normalized in such a way that $d_1 = 1$ then they can be represented in the form

$$d_i = 1 - q_i; \quad d_F = 3 - d,$$

where $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m, d$ satisfy

$$q_1 = 0, \quad q_m = d, \quad q_i + q_{m-i+1} = d.$$

So, under the assumption of Proposition 1.8, we can choose a flat holomorphic local coordinates $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$ of M such that $g_{ij} = \delta_{i+j, m+1}$, $e = \partial_{t^1}$ and

$$(1.12) \quad \mathcal{E} = \sum_i d_i t^i \partial_{t^i} + \sum_{i|d_i=0} r^i \partial_{t^i};$$

$$(1.13) \quad d_1 = 1;$$

$$(1.14) \quad d_i + d_{m+1-i} = 2 - d;$$

$$(1.15) \quad d_F = 3 - d.$$

1.2. CV-structure. In [8] Hertling considers the notion of a CV-structure on any C^∞ vector bundle $K \rightarrow M$. He also considers the notion of a CDV-structure on a manifold, which is a CV-structure on the tangent bundle of a Frobenius manifold M satisfying some compatibility conditions. We now recall these structures and their basic properties.

Definition 1.16 ([8]). Let M be a complex analytic manifold. A $DC\tilde{C}$ -structure is a C^∞ vector bundle $K \rightarrow M$ together with a connection D on it and two C_M^∞ -linear maps

$$\begin{aligned} C : C^\infty(K) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_M^{1,0} \otimes C^\infty(K); \\ \tilde{C} : C^\infty(K) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_M^{0,1} \otimes C^\infty(K) \end{aligned}$$

with the following properties. Let D' and D'' be the $(1, 0)$ -part and the $(0, 1)$ -part of D , then

$$(1.17) \quad (C + D'')^2 = 0, (\tilde{C} + D')^2 = 0;$$

$$(1.18) \quad D'(C) = 0, D''(\tilde{C}) = 0;$$

$$(1.19) \quad D'D'' + D''D' = -(C\tilde{C} + \tilde{C}C).$$

Remark 1.20. a) In this definition, the equations (1.18) and (1.19) are called tt*-equations in [1, 2, 3].

b) by (1.17), we have a family flat $(0, 1)$ -connections $D'' + z\tilde{C}$ on K for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, so K comes equipped with a family of holomorphic structures.

Definition 1.21 ([8]). Let M be a complex analytic manifold. A CV-structure is a quadruple $(K \rightarrow M, D, C, \tilde{C}, \kappa, h, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$ such that $(K \rightarrow M, D, C, \tilde{C})$ is a $DC\tilde{C}$ -structure, and the other objects have the following properties:

- a) κ is a fiberwise $\mathbb{C}$ -anti-linear automorphism of K as a C^∞ - bundle with

$$(1.22) \quad \kappa^2 = \text{Id};$$

$$(1.23) \quad D(\kappa) = 0;$$

$$(1.24) \quad \kappa C \kappa = \tilde{C}.$$

- b) h is a Hermitian pseudo-metric on K ; that is, it is linear on the left, semi-linear on the right, non-degenerate, and satisfies $h(b, a) = \overline{h(a, b)}$. It also has the three properties:

$$(1.25) \quad h \text{ takes real values on } K_{\mathbb{R}} := \ker(\kappa - \text{Id}) \subset K;$$

$$(1.26) \quad h(C_X a, b) = h(a, \tilde{C}_{\overline{X}} b) \quad \text{for } a, b \in C^\infty(K), \quad X \in \mathcal{T}_M^{1,0};$$

$$(1.27) \quad D(h) = 0.$$

- c) $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are C_M^∞ -linear endomorphism of K with

$$(1.28) \quad [C, \mathcal{U}] = 0;$$

$$(1.29) \quad D'(\mathcal{U}) - [C, \mathcal{Q}] + C = 0;$$

$$(1.30) \quad D''(\mathcal{U}) = 0;$$

$$(1.31) \quad D'(\mathcal{Q}) + [C, \kappa \mathcal{U} \kappa] = 0;$$

$$(1.32) \quad \kappa \mathcal{Q} \kappa + \mathcal{Q} = 0;$$

$$(1.33) \quad h(\mathcal{U}a, b) = h(a, \kappa \mathcal{U} \kappa b);$$

$$(1.34) \quad h(\mathcal{Q}a, b) = h(a, \mathcal{Q}b).$$

Remark 1.35. Given any CV-structure $(K \rightarrow M, D, C, \tilde{C}, \kappa, h, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$, if h is positive, then $(K \rightarrow M, D, C, \tilde{C}, \kappa, h, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$ is called *positive CV-structure*, denote by $\text{CV} \oplus$ -structure.

If we combine the Frobenius manifold structure and CV-structure together, then we get the following structure.

Definition 1.36 ([8]). Let M be a complex analytic manifold. A CDV-structure on M is a CV-structure $(\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow M, D, C, \tilde{C}, \kappa, h, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$, together with a Frobenius manifold structure $(M, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, g)$ such that $C_X Y = -X \circ Y$, $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{U}(e)$, and

$$\mathcal{Q} = D_{\mathcal{E}} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}} - \frac{2-d}{2} \text{Id},$$

for some $d \in \mathbb{R}$ and such that the following equivalent conditions hold

$$(1.37) \quad D_e - \mathcal{L}_e = 0;$$

$$(1.38) \quad \Leftrightarrow D_e e = 0;$$

$$(1.39) \quad \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_e(h) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\bar{e}}(h) = 0;$$

$$(1.40) \quad \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_e(\kappa) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\bar{e}}(\kappa) = 0.$$

Given a Frobenius manifold, giving a CDV-structure on it amounts to giving a real structure on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ satisfying some compatibility conditions made precise in the following proposition.

Proposition 1.41 ([8]). *Let M be a complex analytic manifold. A CDV-structure on M is a Frobenius manifold $(M, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, g)$ together with a real structure on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ given by a fiber-wise $\mathbb{C}$ -anti-linear involution $\kappa : \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ such that the following holds:*

- (1) *Extend g to the complex bundle $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$. The form $h := g(\cdot, \kappa \cdot)$ is a Hermitian pseudo-metric and satisfies*

$$(1.42) \quad h(C_X Y, Z) = h(Y, \kappa C_X \kappa Z), \quad \text{for } X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{T}_M;$$

$$(1.43) \quad \mathcal{L}_e(h) = 0;$$

$$(1.44) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}-\bar{\mathcal{E}}}(h) = 0;$$

- (2) *The metric connection D on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ for h respects κ , i.e. $D(h) = 0$ and $D(\kappa) = 0$.*
 (3) *The number d such that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g) = (2 - d) \cdot g$ is real.*
 (4) *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the endomorphism of $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ as real analytic complex vector bundle defined by*

$$\mathcal{Q} := D_{\mathcal{E}} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}} - \frac{2-d}{2} \text{Id},$$

and let $\pi : \mathbb{C} \times M \rightarrow M$ be the projection. Lift D and $\mathcal{Q}$ canonically to $\pi^ \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$. Then*

$$\nabla^{CV} := D + \frac{1}{z} C + z \kappa C \kappa + \left(\frac{1}{z} \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{Q} - z \kappa \mathcal{U} \kappa \right) \frac{dz}{z}$$

is a flat meromorphic connection on $\pi^ \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}|_{\mathbb{C}^* \times M}$.*

1.3. Kähler manifolds. We recall classical results in order to fix notation (see e.g. [13]). Any complex analytic manifold M comes equipped with an almost complex manifold $(M_{\mathbb{R}}, J)$, where $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the underlying real manifold of M , and J is the complex structure induced by i . We get two complex vector bundles on $M_{\mathbb{R}}$: on one hand, $(\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}, i)$ is a complex vector bundle on $M_{\mathbb{R}}$; on the other hand, $(T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}, J)$ is another vector bundle, where $T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}$ is the real tangent bundle of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. These two complex vector bundles are isomorphic. Let us recall the isomorphism.

Let $z^1, z^2, \dots, z^m$ be a system of holomorphic local coordinates on M , and set

$$z^j = x^j + i y^j, \quad \forall j.$$

Then $x^1, \dots, x^m, y^1, \dots, y^m$ is a system of real local coordinates of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and

$$\partial_{z^j} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_{x^j} - i \partial_{y^j}).$$

On $T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}$, J is determined by

$$J\partial_{x^j} = \partial_{y^j}, \quad J\partial_{y^j} = -\partial_{x^j}, \quad \forall j.$$

Define a map $\mathcal{R}e$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}e : (\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}, i) \rightarrow (T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}, J),$$

$$\mathcal{R}e(\partial_{z^j}) := (\partial_{x^j}), \quad \mathcal{R}e(i\partial_{z^j}) := (\partial_{y^j}), \quad \forall j.$$

We note that the map $\mathcal{R}e$ defined above is an isomorphism of real vector bundles on $M_{\mathbb{R}}$, and satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}e \circ i = J \circ \mathcal{R}e,$$

where $\circ$ is the composition of endomorphisms. So it is an isomorphism of complex vector bundles.

Moreover, $\mathcal{R}e$ induces a dual isomorphism

$$\mathcal{R}e^* : \Omega_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_M^{(1,0)}, \quad dx^j \mapsto dz^j, \quad dy^j \mapsto -idz^j, \quad \forall j.$$

So we have an induced isomorphism from $\mathcal{R}e$ and $\mathcal{R}e^{*-1}$:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}e} := \mathcal{R}e \otimes \mathcal{R}e^{*-1} : \mathcal{A}_M^{(1,0)} \otimes \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow \Omega_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}^1 \otimes T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}.$$

Any Hermitian pseudo-metric h on M can be decomposed as

$$h = \widehat{g} - i\widehat{\omega},$$

where $\widehat{g}$ (resp. $-\widehat{\omega}$) is the real part (resp. imaginary part) of h . Then $\widehat{g}$ is a Riemannian pseudo-metric (that is, a symmetric, non-degenerate bilinear form) and $\widehat{\omega}$ is a real $(1,1)$ -form on $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. $(M_{\mathbb{R}}, \widehat{\omega})$ is called a symplectic manifold if $d\widehat{\omega} = 0$. (M, h) is called Kähler if $d\widehat{\omega} = 0$ and h is positive-definite. The Levi-Civita connection of $(T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}, \widehat{g})$ is denoted by $\widehat{\nabla}$, and the Chern connection of $(\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}, h)$ by D' .

Theorem 3.13 in [13] gives a characterization of Kähler metrics: h is Kähler if and only if the Chern connection D' and the Levi-Civita connection $\widehat{\nabla}$ coincide on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$, identified with $T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}$ via the map $\mathcal{R}e$. That means

$$(1.45) \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{R}e}(D'V) = \widehat{\nabla}\mathcal{R}e(V), \quad \forall V \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}.$$

2. MAIN RESULTS

We first give a simple necessary and sufficient condition on a real structure κ to produce a CDV-structure on a Frobenius manifold M .

Theorem 2.1. *Let $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ be a Frobenius manifold, and let κ be an anti-linear involution of $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ such that $h(a, b) := g(a, \kappa b)$ satisfies $h(a, b) = \overline{h(b, a)}$. Let us denote by $D_h = D' + \overline{\partial}$ the Chern connection of h and by d the real number such that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g) = (2 - d)g$. Let us set $\mathcal{Q} := D'_{\mathcal{E}} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}} - \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot \text{Id}$ and let us define Φ by $\Phi_X Y := -X \circ Y$. We also denote by $\mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ and $\Phi^\dagger$ the h -adjoints of $\mathcal{Q}$ and Φ .*

Assume moreover that

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger;$$

$$(2.3) \quad D'(\Phi) = 0; \quad D'\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}D' = -(\Phi \wedge \Phi^\dagger + \Phi^\dagger \wedge \Phi).$$

Then $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ is a CDV-structure.

Clearly, the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 are necessary to get a CDV-structure. When a Frobenius manifold is trivial (cf. Definition 2.5 below), we can find the discussion of the Hermitian metric in Dubrovin's paper [5]. As a consequence, we show that $\text{CDV} \oplus$ -structures exist on all semi-simple Frobenius manifolds by giving an explicit example:

Theorem 2.4. *Let $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ be a semi-simple Frobenius manifold. Let $(u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m)$ be a system of canonical local coordinates of M and let η be the associated metric potential. Define a matrix K of functions on M by*

$$K := \text{diag} \left(\frac{|\eta_1|}{\eta_1}, \frac{|\eta_2|}{\eta_2}, \dots, \frac{|\eta_m|}{\eta_m} \right),$$

Let $\kappa : \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ be the $\mathbb{C}$ anti-linear endomorphism defined by

$$\kappa \partial_{u^\alpha} = K_{\alpha\alpha} \partial_{u^\alpha}.$$

Then $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ is a $\text{CDV} \oplus$ -structure on M with $\mathcal{Q} = 0$, and

$$h = \text{diag}(|\eta_1|, |\eta_2|, \dots, |\eta_m|).$$

Moreover the connection forms $\omega_\alpha^\beta := \sum_\gamma \partial h_{\alpha\gamma} \cdot h^{\gamma\beta}$ for the Chern connection of h are holomorphic and the matrix $\omega = (\omega_\alpha^\beta)$ is given by

$$\omega = \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \eta_1}{2\eta_1}, \frac{\partial \eta_2}{2\eta_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial \eta_m}{2\eta_m} \right).$$

In the second part of this article we compare three natural connections on a non-trivial CDV-structure. Given any CDV-structure $(\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ on a complex analytic manifold M , we have three connections on the tangent bundle. The first one is the Levi-Civita connection ∇ for g , which is a holomorphic connection, that we extend to a $(1,0)$ -connection on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$. The second one is the Chern connection D' with respect to h , where h is defined above by g and κ , which is also a $(1,0)$ -connection on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$. The third one is the Levi-Civita connection $\widehat{\nabla}$ of the Riemannian pseudo-metric $\widehat{g}$ (cf. §1.3), that we consider as a $(1,0)$ -connection on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ by using (1.45) as the definition.

Definition 2.5. A Frobenius manifold $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ is said to be trivial if, locally, the potential function is a polynomial of degree three when expressed in some holomorphic ∇ -flat local coordinates $t^1, \dots, t^m$.

A CDV-structure (resp. a $\text{CDV} \oplus$ -structure) is non-trivial if the underlying Frobenius manifold is non-trivial.

We have the following easy criterion for triviality.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ be a semi-simple Frobenius manifold. Assume that any system of canonical local coordinates is flat. Then the semi-simple Frobenius manifold is trivial and, for any such system of coordinates, the potential η of the metric relative to this system, defined by $g(\partial_{u^\alpha}, \partial_{u^\alpha}) = \partial\eta/\partial u^\alpha$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, m$), is linear in the coordinates up to an additive constant.* $\square$

We first show that ∇ and D' do not coincide on a non-trivial semi-simple CDV-structure.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ be a Frobenius manifold. Suppose that there exists a $\mathbb{C}$ -anti-linear involution κ such that $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ is a CDV-structure.*

- (1) *The following properties are equivalent:*
 - (a) κ is ∇ -flat,
 - (b) $D' = \nabla$.
- (2) *If these properties are satisfied and $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ is semi-simple, then any canonical local coordinate system $(u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m)$ of $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ is ∇ -flat and $\mathcal{Q} = 0$. In particular, the semi-simple Frobenius manifold is trivial. Moreover, if $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ is a $CDV \oplus$ -structure, in any such system of coordinates, the matrices of κ and h are expressed as in Theorem 2.4.*

Let us check that 2.7(1) holds. Because κ defines a CDV-structure, we have $D(\kappa) = 0$, that is, $D'(\kappa) = 0$ and $\bar{\partial}(\kappa) = 0$.

If $D' = \nabla$, we have

$$(\nabla + \bar{\partial})(\kappa) = (D' + \bar{\partial})(\kappa) = 0.$$

Conversely, if κ is ∇ -flat, then $(\nabla + \bar{\partial})(\kappa) = 0$ and

$$\nabla \kappa = \kappa \bar{\partial} = D' \kappa$$

However, κ is an involution of $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$, hence

$$D' = \nabla.$$

Corollary 2.8. *For any non-trivial semi-simple CDV-structure, we have $D' \neq \nabla$.* $\square$

Corollary 2.9. *For any non-trivial semi-simple CDV-structure, the Chern connection D' is not torsion-free.*

Proof. Assume that D' is torsion-free. Because of the relation $D'(g) = 0$, which is deduced from relations (1.23) and (1.27) in the definition of a CDV-structure, we conclude that D' is the Levi-Civita connection of g . So we have $D' = \nabla$, in contradiction with corollary 2.8. $\square$

We will also compare D' and ∇ with the Levi-Civita connection $\hat{\nabla}$ of the Riemannian pseudo-metric $\hat{g}$ (cf. §1.3).

Theorem 2.10. *Let $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ be a non-trivial, semi-simple CDV-structure. Then*

- (1) $\widehat{\omega}$ is not a symplectic form on $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. Moreover, if $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ is a $CDV\oplus$ -structure, then the underlying Hermitian manifold (M, h) is not a Kähler manifold.
- (2) the three connections $\nabla, D', \widehat{\nabla}$ are pairwise distinct (after the identification of $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ with $T_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}$ via $\mathcal{R}e$).

In [12], Atsushi Takahashi shows that the matrix h of a $CDV\oplus$ -structure of dimension two with $d \neq 0$ is diagonal when expressed in holomorphic ∇ -flat local coordinates. In dimension bigger than two, we show that the opposite conclusion holds.

Corollary 2.11. *Let $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ be a non-trivial, semi-simple CDV-structure. If $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} M \geq 3$, then for any ∇ -flat holomorphic local coordinates $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$, the matrix (h_{ij}) cannot be diagonal.*

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREMS

3.1. Necessary and sufficient condition: proof of Theorem 2.1.

In this subsection, we will use a system of holomorphic ∇ -flat local coordinates $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$ of the Frobenius manifold. We will then use the following notations:

$$(3.1) \quad \kappa(\partial_{t^i}) = \sum_k K_{ik} \partial_{t^k},$$

$$(3.2) \quad \Phi_{\partial_{t^i}}(\partial_{t^j}) = - \sum_k C^{(i)k}_j \partial_{t^k},$$

$$(3.3) \quad \Phi_{\overline{\partial}_{t^i}}^{\dagger}(\partial_{t^j}) = - \sum_k \widetilde{C^{(i)k}_j} \partial_{t^k}.$$

If we define $C_{ij}{}^k$ by

$$-\Phi_{\partial_{t^i}}(\partial_{t^j}) = \sum_k C_{ij}{}^k \partial_{t^k},$$

then we have

$$C^{(i)k}_j = C_{ij}{}^k.$$

Because of $h(X, Y) = g(X, \kappa Y)$ and $\Phi^* = \Phi$, we have, for all X, Y ,

$$\begin{aligned} h(X, \Phi^{\dagger} Y) &= h(\Phi X, Y) \\ &= g(\Phi X, \kappa Y) \\ &= h(X, \kappa \Phi \kappa Y), \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\Phi^{\dagger} = \kappa \Phi \kappa.$$

This is expressed by $\widetilde{C^{(i)}} = \overline{K} \cdot \overline{C^{(i)}} \cdot K$, i.e.,

$$\widetilde{C^{(i)}}_j^k = \sum_{p,q} \overline{K}_{jp} \cdot \overline{C_{ip}^q} \cdot K_{qk},$$

Let D_h be the Chern connection of h and let $\omega_i^j := \sum_k \partial h_{ik} \cdot h^{kj}$ be the connection forms for D' in the local holomorphic ∇ -flat coordinates t^i .

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We just need to prove that

$$(\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow M, D_h, \Phi, \Phi^\dagger, \kappa, h, \mathcal{U} := \mathcal{E} \circ, \mathcal{Q})$$

is a CV-structure and

$$D'_e e = 0.$$

Firstly, we will prove that

$$D(\kappa) = 0,$$

which is given by the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.4. *If $h(a, b) = g(a, \kappa b)$ and $\kappa^2 = \text{Id}$ hold, then we have*

$$h^{-1} = \overline{g}^{-1} \cdot \overline{h} \cdot g^{-1}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.4. If $h(a, b) = g(a, \kappa b)$, then

$$h_{ij} = \sum_k K_{jk} \cdot g_{ki},$$

where K is the matrix of κ given by (3.1) and $h_{ij} = h(\partial_{t^i}, \partial_{t^j})$, that is,

$$h^t = K \cdot g.$$

But h satisfies $h(Y, X) = \overline{h(X, Y)}$, so

$$\overline{h} = h^t = K \cdot g,$$

i.e.,

$$K = \overline{h} \cdot g^{-1},$$

and thus

$$h^{-1} = \overline{g}^{-1} \cdot \overline{K}^{-1}.$$

Now we will compute $\overline{K}^{-1}$.

$$\partial_{t^i} = \kappa \kappa(\partial_{t^i}) = \kappa \left(\sum_k K_{ik} \cdot \partial_{t^k} \right) = \sum_k \overline{K_{ik}} \kappa(\partial_{t^k}) = \sum_{k,l} \overline{K_{ik}} \cdot K_{kl} \cdot \partial_{t^l},$$

that is

$$\sum_{k,l} \overline{K_{ik}} \cdot K_{kl} = \delta_i^l.$$

So we have

$$\overline{K} \cdot K = K \cdot \overline{K} = I_{m \times m}.$$

i.e.,

$$\overline{K}^{-1} = K.$$

Therefore,

$$h^{-1} = \bar{g}^{-1} \cdot \bar{K}^{-1} = \bar{g}^{-1} \cdot K = \bar{g}^{-1} \cdot \bar{h} \cdot g^{-1}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, we have*

$$D_h(\kappa) = 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.5. By definition $D_h(\kappa) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$D'_X \kappa = \kappa \bar{\partial}_X, \quad \forall X \in \Theta_M$$

This is equivalent to

$$D'_{\partial_{t_i}} \kappa(\partial_{t_j}) = \kappa \bar{\partial}_{\partial_{t_i}}(\partial_{t_j}) \quad \forall i, j.$$

Clearly, the right-hand term is zero, hence proving $D_h(\kappa) = 0$ amounts to proving

$$(3.6) \quad \partial K + K \cdot \omega = 0.$$

From Lemma 3.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= \partial h \cdot h^{-1} \\ &= (\partial \bar{K} \cdot \bar{g}) \cdot (\bar{g}^{-1} \cdot \bar{h} \cdot g^{-1}) \\ &= \partial \bar{K} \cdot \bar{h} \cdot g^{-1} \\ &= \partial K^{-1} \cdot \bar{h} \cdot g^{-1} \\ &= -K^{-1} \cdot \partial K \cdot K^{-1} \cdot \bar{h} \cdot g^{-1} \\ &= -\bar{K} \cdot \partial K \cdot \bar{K} \cdot \bar{h} \cdot g^{-1} \\ &= -\bar{K} \cdot \partial K \\ &= -K^{-1} \cdot \partial K, \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\omega + K^{-1} \cdot \partial K = 0,$$

which gives (3.6). $\square$

Let us continue the proof of Theorem 2.1. Having proved $D(\kappa) = 0$, we obtain

$$(D')^2 \kappa = D' \kappa \bar{\partial} = \kappa \bar{\partial}^2 = 0,$$

and since κ is an involution, we deduce

$$(D')^2 = 0.$$

So, together with the assumption (2.3), we conclude that $(D_h + \Phi + \Phi^\dagger)^2 = 0$. Hence $(\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow M, D_h, \Phi, \Phi^\dagger)$ is a $(DC\tilde{C})$ -structure.

The relations (1.22), (1.24), (1.25), (1.26), (1.27), (1.28) and (1.30) hold obviously.

The relation (1.29) follows from $D'(\Phi) = 0$. In fact, if $D'(\Phi) = 0$ holds, we have $D'_X(\Phi_\mathcal{E}) - D'_\mathcal{E}(\Phi_X) - \Phi_{[X, \mathcal{E}]} = 0$ for any $X \in \Theta_M$. So $D'(\mathcal{U}) - [\Phi, \mathcal{Q}] + \Phi = 0$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{E}(\circ) = \circ$, which is part of the assumption that M is a Frobenius manifold.

We will show that relation (1.31) can be deduced from the assumption $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ and (2.3).

Lemma 3.7. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, we have*

$$D'(\mathcal{Q}) + [\Phi, \kappa\mathcal{U}\kappa] = 0$$

Proof of Lemma 3.7. We first show that, under the conditions of Theorem 2.1,

$$(3.8) \quad -[\Phi, \kappa\mathcal{U}\kappa] = [\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}, D'_X] + (D' + \bar{\partial})_{[X, \bar{\mathcal{E}}]}, \quad \forall X \in \Theta_M.$$

In fact, $D'\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}D' = -(\Phi \wedge \Phi^\dagger + \Phi^\dagger \wedge \Phi)$ holds, so we have

$$(D'\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}D')(X, \bar{Y}) = -(\Phi \wedge \Phi^\dagger + \Phi^\dagger \wedge \Phi)(X, \bar{Y}), \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}.$$

That is,

$$[D'_X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{Y}}] - (D' + \bar{\partial})_{[X, \bar{Y}]} = -[\Phi_X, \Phi_Y^\dagger].$$

Take $Y = \mathcal{E}$, then

$$[D'_X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}] - (D' + \bar{\partial})_{[X, \bar{\mathcal{E}}]} = -[\Phi_X, \Phi_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}^\dagger] = [\Phi_X, \kappa\mathcal{U}\kappa], \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}.$$

This relation is linear with respect to X , so it holds for all $X \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ if and only if it holds for all $X \in \Theta_M$, hence (3.8).

Now we will prove the lemma by proving

$$(3.9) \quad D'(\mathcal{Q}) = [\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}, D'_X] + (D' + \bar{\partial})_{[X, \bar{\mathcal{E}}]}, \quad \forall X \in \Theta_M.$$

Under the assumptions of the theorem, we have $\mathcal{Q}^\dagger = \mathcal{Q}$, that is,

$$h(\mathcal{Q}X, Y) = h(X, \mathcal{Q}Y), \quad \forall X, Y \in \Theta_M.$$

So $\forall W \in \Theta_M$ we have

$$\partial_W h(\mathcal{Q}X, Y) = h(D'_W \mathcal{Q}X, Y),$$

$$\partial_W h(X, \mathcal{Q}Y) = h(D'_W X, \mathcal{Q}Y) + h(X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{W}} \mathcal{Q}Y),$$

So we get

$$h(D'_W \mathcal{Q}X, Y) - h(D'_W X, \mathcal{Q}Y) = h(X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{W}} \mathcal{Q}Y),$$

i.e.,

$$(3.10) \quad h(D'_W \mathcal{Q}X - \mathcal{Q}D'_W X, Y) = h(X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{W}} \mathcal{Q}Y) = h(X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{W}} D'_\mathcal{E} Y),$$

Claim 1. $h(X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{W}} D'_\mathcal{E} Y) = h(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}} D'_W X, Y)$, $\forall X, Y, W \in \Theta_M$.

In fact,

$$\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}} h(X, Y) = h(X, D'_\mathcal{E} Y)$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_W \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}} h(X, Y) &= \partial_W h(X, D'_\mathcal{E} Y) \\ &= h(D'_W X, D'_\mathcal{E} Y) + h(X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{W}} D'_\mathcal{E} Y) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}\partial_W h(X, Y) &= \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}h(D'_W X, Y) \\ &= h(D'_W X, D'_E Y) + h(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}D'_W X, Y)\end{aligned}$$

Since $W \in \Theta_M$, we get

$$\partial_W \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}h(X, Y) = \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}\partial_W h(X, Y),$$

hence

$$(3.11) \quad h(X, \bar{\partial}_{\bar{W}}D'_E Y) = h(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}D'_W X, Y).$$

The relations (3.10) and (3.11) imply

$$h(D'_W(\mathcal{Q})X, Y) = h(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}D'_W X, Y) = h([\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}, D'_W]X, Y), \quad \forall X, Y, Y \in \Theta_M.$$

Because h is non-degenerate,

$$D'_W(\mathcal{Q}) = [\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}, D'_W] = [\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}}, D'_W] + (D' + \bar{\partial})_{[W, \bar{\mathcal{E}}]}, \quad \forall W \in \Theta_M,$$

hence (3.9), and this ends the proof of Lemma 3.7. $\square$

Let us continue to prove the theorem 2.1.

Claim 2. $D_h(\kappa) = 0 \Leftrightarrow D'(g) = 0$.

We just prove $D_h(\kappa) = 0 \Rightarrow D'(g) = 0$, the other direction holds similarly.

Since D is the Chern connection of h , we have

$$\partial h(X, Y) = h(D'X, Y) + h(X, \bar{\partial}Y), \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}.$$

If $D_h(\kappa) = 0$, by $h(X, Y) = g(X, \kappa Y)$ and $\kappa^2 = \text{Id}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\partial g(X, Y) &= \partial h(X, \kappa Y) \\ &= h(D'X, \kappa Y) + h(X, \bar{\partial}\kappa Y) \\ &= h(D'X, \kappa Y) + h(X, \kappa D'Y) \\ &= g(D'X, Y) + g(X, D'Y),\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$D'(g) = 0. \quad \square$$

Claim 3. *Under the condition $D'(g) = 0$,*

$$\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}^* = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g) = (2 - d) \cdot g.$$

This will prove that $\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}^* = 0$ holds under the assumption of Theorem 2.1, according to Lemma 3.5 and Claim 2, since the relation $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g) = (2 - d) \cdot g$ is included in the definition a Frobenius manifold.

Proof of Claim 3. In fact, by definition, $\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}^* = 0$ is equivalent to

$$g(\mathcal{Q}X, Y) + g(X, \mathcal{Q}Y) = 0.$$

Computing the left hand side of the above relation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\mathcal{Q}X, Y) + g(X, \mathcal{Q}Y) &= g(D'_\varepsilon X, Y) - g(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon X, Y) - \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot g(X, Y) \\
&\quad + g(X, D'_\varepsilon Y) - g(X, \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon Y) - \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot g(X, Y) \\
&= \varepsilon g(X, Y) - g(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon X, Y) - g(X, \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon Y) - (2-d) \cdot g(X, Y) \\
&= \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(g)(X, Y) - (2-d) \cdot g(X, Y) \\
&= [\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(g) - (2-d) \cdot g](X, Y). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

However $\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}^* = 0$ together with the assumption $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ imply

$$\mathcal{Q} + \kappa \mathcal{Q} \kappa = 0.$$

The relation $\mathcal{U}^\dagger = \kappa \mathcal{U} \kappa$ holds because $\Phi^\dagger = \kappa \Phi \kappa$. Hence $(\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)} \rightarrow M, D_h, \Phi, \Phi^\dagger, \kappa, h, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a CV-structure.

It remains to prove $D_e e = 0$. As e is holomorphic, it is enough to prove

$$(3.12) \quad D'_e e = 0.$$

By the assumption of Theorem 2.1, we have $D'(\Phi) = 0$, and since $\Phi_e = -\text{Id}$ this implies

$$D'_e(\Phi_{\partial_{ti}}) = D'_{\partial_{ti}}(\Phi_e) = 0, \quad \forall i$$

and therefore,

$$D'_e(\Phi_{\partial_{ti}})(e) = 0 \quad \forall i.$$

Computing the above relation we get

$$\begin{aligned}
D'_e(\Phi_{\partial_{ti}})(e) &= D'_e(\Phi_{\partial_{ti}}e) - \Phi_{\partial_{ti}}D'_e e \\
&= -D'_e \partial_{ti} + \partial_{ti} \circ D'_e e \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$D'_e \partial_{ti} = \partial_{ti} \circ D'_e e, \quad \forall i.$$

On the other hand, $D'(g) = 0$ holds as a consequence of Lemma 3.5 and Claim 2, hence

$$\partial g(X, Y) = g(D'X, Y) + g(X, D'Y), \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)},$$

and therefore

$$\partial_e g(e, Y) = g(D'_e e, Y) + g(e, D'_e Y), \quad \forall Y \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}.$$

Take $Y = \partial_{ti}$. Then

$$g(e, D'_e \partial_{ti}) = g(e, \partial_{ti} \circ D'_e e) = g(\partial_{ti} \circ e, D'_e e) = g(D'_e e, \partial_{ti}).$$

As a consequence, since e is holomorphic and flat,

$$0 = e g(e, \partial_{ti}) = g(D'_e e, \partial_{ti}) + g(e, D'_e \partial_{ti}) = 2g(D'_e e, \partial_{ti}) \quad \forall i,$$

giving thus (3.12). This ends the proof of Theorem 2.1. $\square$

3.2. Existence of a CDV $\oplus$ -structure: proof of Theorem 2.4.

Let $(u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m)$ be a system of canonical local coordinates of M . We will denote $e_\alpha = \partial_{u^\alpha}$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$. The matrix K defined in Theorem 2.4 obviously satisfies

$$\overline{K} \cdot K = I_{m \times m}.$$

Therefore, the associated anti-linear endomorphism κ is an involution of $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$. We will check this κ together with the Frobenius manifold structure define a CDV $\oplus$ -structure on M .

Let h be the sesquilinear form associated to κ and g as in Proposition 1.41(1). Then

$$(3.13) \quad (h_{\alpha\beta})_{m \times m} = \text{diag}(|\eta_1|, |\eta_2|, \dots, |\eta_m|).$$

Since g is non-degenerate, $\eta_\alpha := g(e_\alpha, e_\alpha)$ does not vanish and h is a Hermitian metric on M . Let D' be the Chern connection of h . Then the matrix ω of connection forms of D' satisfies

$$\omega = \text{diag}(\partial \log |\eta_1|, \partial \log |\eta_2|, \dots, \partial \log |\eta_m|).$$

By a straightforward computation we get

$$(3.14) \quad \omega = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\partial \eta_1}{2\eta_1}, \frac{\partial \eta_2}{2\eta_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial \eta_m}{2\eta_m}\right).$$

So all ω_α^α are holomorphic 1-forms.

Claim. *The Chern connection D' of h defined by (3.13) satisfies (2.3).*

The relation $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is a consequence the following lemma.

Lemma 3.15. *Let M be a semi-simple Frobenius manifold M of dimension m and let h be a non-degenerate sesquilinear form on M , with associated Chern connection D' . Let $(u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a local system of canonical coordinates on M and let $\omega = (\omega_\alpha^\beta)$ be the connection matrix of h in these coordinates. Then $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to*

- $\omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\alpha + e_\beta) = 0$, $\forall \alpha \neq \beta$, if $m = 2$,
- and, if $m \geq 3$, to

$$\begin{cases} \omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\gamma) = 0, & \forall \gamma \neq \alpha, \gamma \neq \beta, \alpha \neq \beta, \\ \omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\alpha + e_\beta) = 0, & \forall \alpha \neq \beta. \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.15. By definition $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$D'_{e_\alpha}(\Phi_{e_\beta}) = D'_{e_\beta}(\Phi_{e_\alpha}), \quad \forall \alpha, \beta,$$

that is, to

$$(3.16) \quad D'_{e_\alpha}(\Phi_{e_\beta})(e_\gamma) = D'_{e_\beta}(\Phi_{e_\alpha})(e_\gamma), \quad \forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma.$$

Assume that α, β, γ are pairwise distinct. Then, because (u^α) are canonical, $\Phi_{e_\alpha}(e_\gamma) = 0$ and $\Phi_{e_\beta}(e_\gamma) = 0$, so

$$\begin{aligned} D'_{e_\alpha}(\Phi_{e_\beta})(e_\gamma) - D'_{e_\beta}(\Phi_{e_\alpha})(e_\gamma) &= e_\beta \circ D'_{e_\alpha}e_\gamma - e_\alpha \circ D'_{e_\beta}e_\gamma \\ &= \omega_\gamma^\beta(e_\alpha)e_\beta - \omega_\gamma^\alpha(e_\beta)e_\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any such α, β, γ , $D'_{e_\alpha}(\Phi_{e_\beta})(e_\gamma) = D'_{e_\beta}(\Phi_{e_\alpha})(e_\gamma)$ is equivalent to

$$\omega_\gamma^\beta(e_\alpha) = 0.$$

Assume now $\alpha \neq \beta$ and take $\gamma = \alpha$ in the relation (3.16). Then

$$\begin{aligned} D'_{e_\alpha}(\Phi_{e_\beta})(e_\alpha) - D'_{e_\beta}(\Phi_{e_\alpha})(e_\alpha) &= e_\beta \circ D'_{e_\alpha}e_\alpha - e_\alpha \circ D'_{e_\beta}e_\alpha + D'_{e_\beta}e_\alpha \\ &= \omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\alpha)e_\beta - \omega_\alpha^\alpha(e_\beta)e_\beta + \sum_{\gamma} \omega_\alpha^\gamma(e_\beta)e_\gamma \\ &= \omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\alpha)e_\beta + \sum_{\gamma \neq \alpha} \omega_\alpha^\gamma(e_\beta)e_\gamma \\ &= \omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\alpha)e_\beta + \omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\beta)e_\beta, \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because $\omega_\gamma^\beta(e_\alpha) = 0$, $\forall \gamma \neq \alpha, \gamma \neq \beta$. So $D'_{e_\alpha}(\Phi_{e_\beta})(e_\alpha) - D'_{e_\beta}(\Phi_{e_\alpha})(e_\alpha) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\omega_\alpha^\beta(e_\alpha + e_\beta) = 0. \quad \square$$

We continue to prove Theorem 2.4. Since ω is diagonal, we have $D'(\Phi) = 0$ according to Lemma 3.15. Let us now consider the other equation in (2.3).

Lemma 3.17. *Given any quadruple $(M, D', \Phi, \Phi^\dagger)$, where M is a complex analytic manifold, D' is a $(1, 0)$ connection on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$, Φ and $\Phi^\dagger$ are $\mathcal{C}_M^\infty$ -linear maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{T}_M^{1,0} &\rightarrow \mathcal{A}_M^{1,0} \otimes \mathcal{T}_M^{1,0}, \\ \Phi^\dagger : \mathcal{T}_M^{1,0} &\rightarrow \mathcal{A}_M^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{T}_M^{1,0}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the relation $D'\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}D' = -(\Phi \wedge \Phi^\dagger + \Phi^\dagger \wedge \Phi)$ is equivalent to

$$\overline{\partial_{z^j}}\omega(\partial_{z^i}) = [\widetilde{C^{(j)}}, C^{(i)}], \quad \forall i, j.$$

where z^j are any holomorphic local coordinates of M , and ω is the matrix of connection forms for D' . Moreover, $C^{(i)}$ and $\widetilde{C^{(j)}}$ are defined by relations (3.2) and (3.3).

Proof. Straightforward computation. $\square$

The quadruple $(M, D', \Phi, \Phi^\dagger)$ we defined above satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.17, so by Lemma 3.17 applied with canonical coordinates, we are reduced to proving

$$(3.18) \quad \overline{\partial_\beta}\omega(\partial_\alpha) = [\widetilde{C^{(\beta)}}, C^{(\alpha)}], \quad \forall \alpha, \beta,$$

where the matrices $C^{(\alpha)}$ and $\widetilde{C^{(\beta)}}$ are defined by (3.2) and (3.3) in canonical local coordinates.

Firstly, we will compute the right hand side of (3.18). Obviously, in a system of canonical local coordinates of the Frobenius manifold, the matrices $C^{(\alpha)}$ satisfy

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{cases} C^{(\alpha)}_{\beta}^{\gamma} = 1, & \text{if } \gamma = \alpha = \beta, \\ C^{(\alpha)}_{\beta}^{\gamma} = 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now we will compute $\widetilde{C^{(\beta)}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{C^{(\beta)}} &= \overline{K} \cdot \overline{C^{(\beta)}} \cdot K \\ &= \text{diag} \left(0, \dots, 0, \frac{|\eta_{\beta}|}{\eta_{\beta}}, \frac{|\eta_{\beta}|}{\eta_{\beta}}, \dots, 0, \dots, 0 \right) \\ &= \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \\ &= C^{(\beta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$[\widetilde{C^{(\beta)}}, C^{(\alpha)}] = 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta.$$

Now we just need to check

$$\overline{e_{\beta}} \omega(e_{\alpha}) = 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta.$$

Since all $\eta_{\alpha} = g_{\alpha\alpha}$ are nonzero holomorphic functions, we get that all $\omega_{\alpha}^{\alpha} = e_{\alpha} \eta_{\alpha} / 2\eta_{\alpha}$ are holomorphic. Hence

$$\overline{e_{\beta}} \omega_{\gamma}^{\gamma}(e_{\alpha}) = 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma.$$

This finishes the proof of the claim. The relation $\mathcal{Q}^{\dagger} = \mathcal{Q}$ is implied by the relation $\mathcal{Q} := D'_{\mathcal{E}} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}} - \frac{2-d}{2} \text{Id} = 0$, that we now prove.

We again use a system of canonical local coordinates u^{α} . We can normalize it in such a way that

$$\mathcal{E} = \sum_{\alpha} u^{\alpha} e_{\alpha}.$$

Therefore,

$$(3.20) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}} e_{\alpha} = -e_{\alpha}, \quad \forall \alpha.$$

Let us now recall:

Lemma 3.21 ([9]: Theorem 3.6, p.31). *Let $(M, \circ, g, e, \mathcal{E})$ be a semi-simple Frobenius manifold and let $u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m$ be a system of canonical local coordinates of M such that $\mathcal{E} = \sum_{\alpha} u^{\alpha} e_{\alpha}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g) = (2-d)g \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}g(\partial_{u^{\alpha}}, \partial_{u^{\alpha}}) = (-d) \cdot g(\partial_{u^{\alpha}}, \partial_{u^{\alpha}}), \quad \forall \alpha.$$

Since the relation $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g) = (2-d)g$ is included in the definition of a Frobenius manifold, by lemma 3.21, we have

$$\mathcal{E} \eta_{\alpha} = (-d) \cdot \eta_{\alpha}, \quad \forall \alpha,$$

so we have,

$$\begin{aligned} D'_\mathcal{E} e_\alpha &= \omega_\alpha^\alpha(\mathcal{E}) \cdot e_\alpha \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{E}\eta_\alpha}{2\eta_\alpha} \cdot e_\alpha \\ &= \frac{-d}{2} \cdot e_\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all α , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}e_\alpha &= D'_\mathcal{E} e_\alpha - \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{E} e_\alpha - \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot \text{Id} \\ &= \frac{-d}{2} \cdot e_\alpha + e_\alpha - \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot \text{Id} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.1, we conclude that $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E}, \kappa)$ is a $\text{CDV} \oplus$ -structure on M with $\mathcal{Q} = 0$. $\square$

Remark 3.22. For dimension two, under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, we get a $\text{CDV} \oplus$ -structure on M which is contained in the discussion of [12].

3.3. Comparison of three connections and non-Kähler property. In the proof of theorem 2.7, we will use a system of canonical local coordinates $u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m$. We normalize the canonical local coordinates $u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m$ in such a way that $\mathcal{E} = \sum_\alpha u^\alpha e_\alpha$.

Proof of theorem 2.7. We assume that κ is ∇ -flat.

Claim. *The matrix of connection forms ω_α^β for D' is diagonal in (u^α) .*

Proof. Since $D' = \nabla$, (2.3) implies

$$(\Phi \wedge \Phi^\dagger + \Phi^\dagger \wedge \Phi) = -(D'\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}D') = -(\nabla\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}\nabla) = 0.$$

By a straightforward computation, we get

$$(3.23) \quad [\widetilde{C^{(\beta)}}, C^{(\alpha)}] = 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta.$$

Using (3.19), (3.23) implies

$$\overline{K_{\nu\beta}} \cdot K_{\beta\alpha} \cdot \delta_{\gamma\alpha} = \overline{K_{\alpha\beta}} \cdot K_{\beta\gamma} \cdot \delta_{\nu\alpha}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \nu.$$

Taking $\nu = \alpha, \gamma \neq \alpha$, we get

$$(3.24) \quad \overline{K_{\alpha\beta}} \cdot K_{\beta\gamma} = 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \text{ with } \alpha \neq \gamma.$$

By the non-degeneracy of κ , for any β there exists an index μ_β such that $K_{\mu_\beta\beta} \neq 0$. From relation (3.24), we have

$$\overline{K_{\mu_\beta\beta}} \cdot K_{\beta\gamma} = 0, \quad \forall \beta, \gamma \text{ with } \gamma \neq \mu_\beta,$$

Hence we get

$$K_{\beta\gamma} = 0, \quad \forall \gamma \neq \mu_\beta.$$

That is, for any β , there exists a unique μ_β , such that $K_{\beta\mu_\beta} \neq 0$. Similarly, for any γ , there exists unique ν_γ , such that $K_{\nu_\gamma\gamma} \neq 0$.

Assume that there exist α such that $\nu_\alpha \neq \mu_\alpha$. We will deduce a contradiction. By relation (3.24), we get

$$\overline{K_{\nu_\alpha\alpha}} \cdot K_{\alpha\mu_\alpha} = 0.$$

Hence we get that either $K_{\nu_\alpha\alpha} = 0$ or $K_{\alpha\mu_\alpha} = 0$. This gives a contradiction.

So we conclude that for any α , there exists a unique ν_α such that

$$(3.25) \quad \overline{K_{\alpha\nu_\alpha}} \cdot K_{\nu_\alpha\alpha} \neq 0.$$

Since the relation (1.23) is included in the definition of a CDV-structure, by straightforward computations, we have

$$(3.26) \quad \omega = -\overline{K} \cdot \partial K.$$

By relations (3.24), (3.25) and (3.26), we get

$$(3.27) \quad \omega_\alpha^\beta = -\delta_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \overline{K_{\alpha\nu_\alpha}} \cdot \partial K_{\nu_\alpha\alpha}, \forall \alpha, \beta.$$

Hence we conclude that

$$\omega = \text{diag}(-\overline{K_{1\nu_1}} \cdot \partial K_{\nu_1 1}, \dots, -\overline{K_{m\nu_m}} \cdot \partial K_{\nu_m m}). \quad \square$$

Let η be the metric potential in the coordinates u^α , i.e.,

$$\eta_\alpha = g_{\alpha\alpha} = e_\alpha \eta.$$

We want to prove that $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m$ are ∇ -flat, so we just need to prove all η_α are constants, i.e.

$$\overline{e_\alpha} \eta_\beta = e_\alpha \eta_\beta = 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta.$$

Claim. $e_\alpha \eta_\beta = 0, \forall \alpha, \beta$.

Proof. We have shown that ω is diagonal, hence

$$D'_{e_\alpha} e_\beta = \omega_\beta^\beta(e_\alpha) \cdot e_\beta.$$

Let us recall:

Lemma 3.28 ([9], proof of Theorem 3.3, p. 28-30). *Let $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ be a semi-simple Frobenius manifold, and let $u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m$ be a system of canonical local coordinates of M . Then*

$$\nabla_\alpha e_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \eta_\alpha^{-1} e_\alpha \eta_\alpha \cdot e_\alpha - \sum_{\gamma \neq \alpha} \frac{1}{2} \eta_\gamma^{-1} e_\gamma \eta_\alpha \cdot e_\gamma.$$

For $\alpha \neq \beta$ we have

$$\nabla_\alpha e_\beta = \frac{1}{2} \eta_\alpha^{-1} e_\beta \eta_\alpha \cdot e_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \eta_\beta^{-1} e_\alpha \eta_\beta \cdot e_\beta.$$

By Lemma 3.28, for $\alpha \neq \beta$, we have

$$\nabla_\alpha e_\beta = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \eta_\alpha^{-1} \cdot (e_\beta \eta_\alpha) \cdot e_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \eta_\beta^{-1} \cdot (e_\alpha \eta_\beta) \cdot e_\beta.$$

From $D' = \nabla$ we get

$$\omega_\beta^\beta(e_\alpha) \cdot e_\beta = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \eta_\alpha^{-1} \cdot (e_\beta \eta_\alpha) \cdot e_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \eta_\beta^{-1} \cdot (e_\alpha \eta_\beta) \cdot e_\beta, \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta.$$

Comparing the coefficients of e_β gives

$$(3.29) \quad e_\alpha \eta_\beta = 0, \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta.$$

Lemma 3.28 and (3.29) give

$$(3.30) \quad \nabla_\alpha e_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \eta_\alpha^{-1} \cdot (e_\alpha \eta_\alpha) \cdot e_\alpha$$

and

$$(3.31) \quad \nabla_\alpha e_\beta = 0, \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta.$$

Recall also that the unit $e = \sum e_\alpha$ is ∇ -flat, i.e.

$$(3.32) \quad \nabla_{e_\alpha} e = 0, \quad \forall \alpha.$$

By relations (3.30), (3.31) and (3.32), we get

$$\eta_\alpha^{-1} e_\alpha \eta_\alpha \cdot e_\alpha = 2 \cdot \nabla_{e_\alpha} e_\alpha = \nabla_{e_\alpha} e = 0,$$

i.e.

$$(3.33) \quad e_\alpha \eta_\alpha = 0, \quad \forall \alpha. \quad \square$$

From the claim, we get

$$\partial \eta_\alpha = 0, \quad \forall \alpha.$$

Since all η_α are holomorphic, we get $\bar{\partial} \eta_\alpha = 0$, $\forall \alpha$, i.e.

$$(3.34) \quad dg_{\alpha\alpha} = d\eta_\alpha = 0, \quad \forall \alpha.$$

Hence we conclude that $u^1, u^2, \dots, u^m$ are ∇ -flat holomorphic local coordinates of M . Arguing now as in Theorem 2.4, we conclude that $\mathcal{Q} = 0$.

Moreover, if h is positive, since $h_{\alpha\alpha} = K_{\alpha\alpha} \cdot \eta_\alpha > 0$, we get

$$\nu_\alpha = \alpha, \quad \forall \alpha.$$

So we conclude that

$$h_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} \cdot |\eta_\alpha|.$$

Arguing now as in Theorem 2.4, we conclude that the matrices of κ and h are expressed as in Theorem 2.4 in (u^α) , which ends the proof of Theorem 2.7. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.10 (1). Recall that we set $h = \widehat{g} - i\widehat{\omega}$ and we have $\widehat{\omega} = g(\cdot, J\cdot)$. The relation $d\widehat{\omega} \neq 0$ is a consequence the following lemma.

Lemma 3.35. *Let M be a complex analytic manifold. Let h be a Hermitian pseudo-metric on it. Let $-\widehat{\omega}$ be the imaginary part of h . Denote by D' the Chern connection of h . Then*

$$d\widehat{\omega} = 0 \Leftrightarrow D'_X Y - D'_Y X = [X, Y], \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}.$$

Proof. Let $t^1, \dots, t^m$ be any system of holomorphic local coordinates of M . Then

$$(3.36) \quad \widehat{\omega} = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{k,l} h_{kl} dt^k \wedge \overline{dt^l},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\widehat{\omega} &= \frac{i}{2} \sum_{k,l,p} \partial_{t^p} h_{kl} dt^p \wedge dt^k \wedge \overline{dt^l} \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \sum_{k < p, l} [\partial_{t^p} h_{kl} - \partial_{t^k} h_{pl}] dt^p \wedge dt^k \wedge \overline{dt^l}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(3.37) \quad \partial\widehat{\omega} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \partial_{t^k} h_{ij} = \partial_{t^i} h_{kj}, \quad \forall i, j, k.$$

Similarly, we get

$$(3.38) \quad \overline{\partial}\widehat{\omega} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \overline{\partial}_{t^k} h_{ji} = \overline{\partial}_{t^i} h_{jk}, \quad \forall i, j, k.$$

Since h is Hermitian, this implies $\overline{\partial}\widehat{\omega} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \partial\widehat{\omega} = 0$, and therefore

$$d\widehat{\omega} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \overline{\partial}\widehat{\omega} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \partial\widehat{\omega} = 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(3.39) \quad \partial_{t^k} h_{ij} = \partial_{t^i} h_{kj}, \quad \forall i, j, k.$$

Denote by ω_i^j the connection forms of D' with respect to (t^i) . Since (t^i) are holomorphic, we have

$$(3.40) \quad \omega_i^j = (\partial h \cdot h^{-1})_{ij}.$$

By relation (3.40), we conclude that relation (3.39) is equivalent to

$$\omega_i^j(\partial_{t^k}) - \omega_k^j(\partial_{t^i}) = 0.$$

However, the above relation is equivalent to

$$D'_{\partial_{t^i}} \partial_{t^j} - D'_{\partial_{t^j}} \partial_{t^i} - [\partial_{t^i}, \partial_{t^j}] = 0, \quad \forall i, j,$$

i.e. D' is torsion free. $\square$

So, by Corollary 2.9 and Lemma 3.35, we conclude that $d\widehat{\omega} \neq 0$, i.e. $\widehat{\omega}$ is not a symplectic form on $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. $\square$

Proof of theorem 2.10 (2). Assume that $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}e}D' = \widehat{\nabla}\mathcal{R}e$, we will derive a contradiction.

Lemma 3.41. *Let M be a complex analytic manifold. Let h be a Hermitian pseudo-metric on it. Let $\hat{g}$ be the real part of h . Denote by $\hat{\nabla}$ the Levi-Civita connection of $\hat{g}$. If $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}e}D' = \hat{\nabla}\mathcal{R}e$, then D' is torsion free.*

Proof. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}e}D' = \hat{\nabla}\mathcal{R}e$, then for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$, set $X = X_1 + iX_2, Y = Y_1 + iY_2$, where $X_i, Y_j \in \mathcal{T}_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}$. By a straightforward computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D'_X Y &= \mathcal{R}e(D'_X Y) + i\mathcal{I}m(D'_X Y) \\
&= \mathcal{R}e(D'_X Y) - i\mathcal{R}e(D'_X iY) \\
&= \mathcal{R}e(D'_{X_1} Y + iD'_{X_2} Y) - i\mathcal{R}e(iD'_{X_1} Y + i^2 D'_{X_2} Y) \\
&= \mathcal{R}e(D'_{X_1} Y + D'_{X_2} iY) - i\mathcal{R}e(D'_{X_1} iY - D'_{X_2} Y) \\
&= \mathcal{R}e(D'_{X_1} Y) + \mathcal{R}e(D'_{X_2} iY) - i\mathcal{R}e(D'_{X_1} iY) + i\mathcal{R}e(D'_{X_2} Y) \\
&= \hat{\nabla}_{X_1} \mathcal{R}e(Y) + \hat{\nabla}_{X_2} \mathcal{R}e(iY) - i\hat{\nabla}_{X_1} \mathcal{R}e(iY) + i\hat{\nabla}_{X_2} \mathcal{R}e(Y), \\
&= \hat{\nabla}_{X_1} Y_1 - \hat{\nabla}_{X_2} Y_2 + i\hat{\nabla}_{X_1} Y_2 + i\hat{\nabla}_{X_2} Y_1, \\
&= (\hat{\nabla}_{X_1} Y_1 - \hat{\nabla}_{X_2} Y_2) + i(\hat{\nabla}_{X_1} Y_2 + \hat{\nabla}_{X_2} Y_1).
\end{aligned}$$

The sixth equality holds because of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}e}D' = \hat{\nabla}\mathcal{R}e$ and $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{T}_{M_{\mathbb{R}}}$. Similarly, we get

$$D'_Y X = (\hat{\nabla}_{Y_1} X_1 - \hat{\nabla}_{Y_2} X_2) + i(\hat{\nabla}_{Y_1} X_2 + \hat{\nabla}_{Y_2} X_1).$$

Since $\hat{\nabla}$ is a torsion-free connection, i.e.

$$\hat{\nabla}_{W_i} W_j - \hat{\nabla}_{W_j} W_i = [W_i, W_j], \quad \forall W_i, W_j \in \mathcal{T}_{M_{\mathbb{R}}},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
D'_X Y - D'_Y X &= (\hat{\nabla}_{X_1} Y_1 - \hat{\nabla}_{X_2} Y_2) + i(\hat{\nabla}_{X_1} Y_2 + \hat{\nabla}_{X_2} Y_1) \\
&\quad - (\hat{\nabla}_{Y_1} X_1 - \hat{\nabla}_{Y_2} X_2) - i(\hat{\nabla}_{Y_1} X_2 + \hat{\nabla}_{Y_2} X_1) \\
&= \{[X_1, Y_1] - [X_2, Y_2]\} + i\{[X_1, Y_2] + [X_2, Y_1]\} \\
&= [X, Y].
\end{aligned}$$

That is, D' is torsion-free. $\square$

By Corollary 2.9, D' is not torsion-free. However, by Lemma 3.41, we get that D' is torsion-free. This gives a contradiction.

In order to end the proof of Theorem 2.10 (2), it remains to see that ∇ and $\hat{\nabla}$ cannot coincide. Let us now assume that $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$ are ∇ -flat holomorphic local coordinates of M . Set $t^j = x^j + iy^j$, then $x^1, \dots, x^m, y^1, \dots, y^m$ is a system of real local coordinates of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Claim. *If $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}e}\nabla = \hat{\nabla}\mathcal{R}e$, then $x^1, \dots, x^m, y^1, \dots, y^m$ are $\hat{\nabla}$ -flat.*

Proof. Indeed, for any X in $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$, we then have $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}e}(\nabla X) = \hat{\nabla}\mathcal{R}e(X)$. Applying this to $X = \partial_{t^j}$ (resp. $X = i\partial_{t^j}$) gives the $\hat{\nabla}$ -flatness of ∂_{x^j} (resp. ∂_{y^j}). $\square$

So $\widehat{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})$, $\widehat{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{y^j})$, and $\widehat{g}(\partial_{y^i}, \partial_{y^j})$ are constants, hence all $\widehat{\omega}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{y^j}) = \widehat{g}(\partial_{x^i}, J\partial_{x^j})$ are constant. Similarly, all $\widehat{\omega}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})$, $\widehat{\omega}(\partial_{y^i}, \partial_{x^j})$, and $\widehat{\omega}(\partial_{y^i}, \partial_{y^j})$ are constant.

By relation (3.36), we conclude that all h_{kl} are constant and from (3.37) and (3.38) this implies $d\widehat{\omega} = 0$. We conclude as above to a contradiction. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2.11. Let $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$ be a system of ∇ -flat holomorphic local coordinates of M such that $e = \partial_{t_1}$. Denote by ω_i^j the connection forms of D' with respect to t^i . Assume that the matrix $h = (h_{ij})$ is diagonal. We will derive a contradiction. The matrix h^{-1} is then also diagonal. It follows from (3.40) that

$$\omega_i^j = 0, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

For any CDV-structure, it follows from (1.23), (1.27) and Claim 2 that the Chern connection D' and g satisfy

$$(3.42) \quad D'(g) = 0.$$

Under the condition $\omega_i^j = 0, \forall i \neq j$, (3.42) is equivalent to

$$(3.43) \quad (\omega_i^i + \omega_j^j)g_{ij} = 0, \quad \forall i, j.$$

By the non-degeneracy of g , we know that, for any j , there exists a k_j such that $g_{jk_j} \neq 0$. So from (3.43), we deduce

$$(3.44) \quad \omega_j^j = -\omega_{k_j}^{k_j}.$$

Claim. $\omega_j^j = 0, \forall j$.

Proof of the claim. For any j , set $K_j = \{\ell \mid g_{j\ell} \neq 0\}$. If $j \in K_j$, the claim follows from (3.44). Assume now that $j \notin K_j$. The above claim can be deduced from the following lemma.

Lemma 3.45. *Given any quadruple (M, ∇, Φ, D') , where M is a complex analytic manifold, ∇ is a flat holomorphic connection on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$, Φ is a holomorphic symmetric Higgs field on M such that $\nabla(\Phi) = 0$, and D' is a $(1,0)$ connection on $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$. Denote by $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$ a system of holomorphic ∇ -flat local coordinates of M , and by ω_i^j the connection forms for D' . Then*

$$D'(\Phi) = 0 \Leftrightarrow T_{kj} = T_{jk}, \quad \forall j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\},$$

where $T_{kj} := [C^{(k)}, \omega(j)]$, the matrices $C^{(j)}$ are defined by the relations (3.2), and $\omega(k)$ are defined by

$$\omega(k) := (\omega_p^q(\partial_{t^k}))_{m \times m}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.45. $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$D'_{\partial_{t^j}}(\Phi_{\partial_{t^k}})(\partial_{t^i}) = D'_{\partial_{t^k}}(\Phi_{\partial_{t^j}})(\partial_{t^i}), \quad \forall i, j, k.$$

Computing $D'_{\partial_{tj}}(\Phi_{\partial_{tk}})(\partial_{ti})$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
D'_{\partial_{tj}}(\Phi_{\partial_{tk}})(\partial_{ti}) &= D'_{\partial_{tj}}(\Phi_{\partial_{tk}} \partial_{ti}) - (\Phi_{\partial_{tk}})(D'_{\partial_{tj}} \partial_{ti}) \\
&= - \sum_l D'_{\partial_{tj}}(C_{ik}^l \partial_{tl}) - \sum_l \omega_i^l(\partial_{tj}) \Phi_{\partial_{tk}}(\partial_{tl}) \\
&= - \sum_l \partial_{tj}(C_{ik}^l) \partial_{tl} - \sum_l C_{ik}^l D'_{\partial_{tj}} \partial_{tl} - \sum_l \omega_i^l(\partial_{tj}) \Phi_{\partial_{tk}}(\partial_{tl}) \\
&= - \sum_l \partial_{tj}(C_{ik}^l) \partial_{tl} - \sum_{l,p} C_{ik}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tj}) \partial_{tp} + \sum_{l,p} \omega_i^l(\partial_{tj}) C_{kl}^p \partial_{tp}.
\end{aligned}$$

Computing $D'_{\partial_{tk}}(\Phi_{\partial_{tj}})(\partial_{ti})$ similarly we get

$$\begin{aligned}
D'_{\partial_{tk}}(\Phi_{\partial_{tj}})(\partial_{ti}) &= - \sum_l \partial_{tk}(C_{ij}^l) \partial_{tl} - \sum_{l,p} C_{ij}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tk}) \partial_{tp} + \sum_{l,p} \omega_i^l(\partial_{tk}) C_{jl}^p \partial_{tp}.
\end{aligned}$$

Because of the assumptions $\nabla^2 = 0$ and $\nabla(\Phi) = 0$, we conclude that

$$- \sum_l \partial_{tj}(C_{ik}^l) \partial_{tl} = - \sum_l \partial_{tk}(C_{ij}^l) \partial_{tl}, \forall i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

So $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to the following relation

$$\begin{aligned}
- \sum_{l,p} C_{ik}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tj}) \partial_{tp} + \sum_{l,p} \omega_i^l(\partial_{tj}) C_{kl}^p \partial_{tp} \\
= - \sum_{l,p} C_{ij}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tk}) \partial_{tp} + \sum_{l,p} \omega_i^l(\partial_{tk}) C_{jl}^p \partial_{tp},
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{l,p} [C_{ik}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tj}) - \omega_i^l(\partial_{tj}) C_{kl}^p] \partial_{tp} = \sum_{l,p} [C_{ij}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tk}) - \omega_i^l(\partial_{tk}) C_{jl}^p] \partial_{tp}.$$

So $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_l [C_{ki}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tj}) - C_{kl}^p \omega_i^l(\partial_{tj})] = \sum_l [C_{ji}^l \omega_l^p(\partial_{tk}) - C_{jl}^p \omega_i^l(\partial_{tk})],$$

$\forall i, j, k, p \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, which is the desired relation. $\square$

Let us continue to prove the claim. Since for any CDV-structure, the underlying quadruple (M, ∇, Φ, D') satisfies the assumption of lemma 3.45, and the relation $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is included in the definition of a CDV-structure, we get

$$(3.46) \quad [C^{(j)}, \omega(k)] = [C^{(k)}, \omega(j)], \quad \forall k, j.$$

Note also that $C_{j1}^q = \delta_{jq}$ because $\partial_{t1} = e$. So for any p, q , from relation (3.46), we have

$$\sum_l [C_{jp}^l \omega_l^q(\partial_{tk}) - \omega_p^l(\partial_{tk}) C_{jl}^q] = \sum_l [C_{kp}^l \omega_l^q(\partial_{tj}) - \omega_p^l(\partial_{tj}) C_{kl}^q].$$

Taking $p = 1, q = j$, we get

$$(3.47) \quad \omega_j^j(\partial_{t^k}) = \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^k}), \quad \forall k \neq j.$$

For any k , because $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} M \geq 3$, there exists $j \neq k$ such that there exists $k_j \in K_j$ with $k_j \neq k$ (otherwise, there would exist k such that, for any $j \neq k$, we have $K_j = \{k\}$; this would imply that the matrix $(g_{j\ell})$ has zero entries except in the k th line and the k th column, so its rank is at most two, which contradicts its invertibility when $\dim M \geq 3$). Then, by (3.44) and (3.47),

$$\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^k}) = \omega_j^j(\partial_{t^k}) = -\omega_{k_j}^{k_j}(\partial_{t^k}) = -\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^k}), \quad \forall k,$$

hence $\omega_1^1 = 0$ and $\omega_j^j(\partial_{t^k}) = 0 \quad \forall k \neq j$. On the other hand, if $k_j \in K_j$, we have $j \neq k_j$, so

$$\omega_j^j(\partial_{t^j}) = -\omega_{k_j}^{k_j}(\partial_{t^j}) = -\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^j}) = 0. \quad \square$$

The claim implies

$$D'\partial_{t^i} = \sum_j \omega_i^j \partial_j = 0, \quad \forall i.$$

Hence we have

$$\nabla \partial_{t^j} = 0 = D'\partial_{t^j}, \quad \forall j,$$

that is,

$$D' = \nabla.$$

However, by Corollary 2.8, we know that $D' \neq \nabla$. This gives a contradiction. $\square$

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1. Some consequences of Theorem 2.1. Given any Frobenius manifold M of dimension m , if we suppose that $g(e, e) = 0$ and that the eigenvalues of $\nabla \mathcal{E}$ are simple, then by Proposition 1.8, we can choose ∇ -flat holomorphic local coordinates $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$ of M such that the relations (1.9), (1.10), (1.11), (1.12), (1.13), (1.14) and (1.15) hold. We will give a local expression of the relations given in the definition of CDV-structure in these local coordinates. Let us denote by ω the matrix (ω_k^l) defined by

$$(4.1) \quad D'\partial_{t^k} = \sum_l \omega_k^l \partial_{t^l}$$

in any system of holomorphic local coordinates $t^1, t^2, \dots, t^m$ of M .

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, the relation $D'(g) = 0$ is equivalent to $\omega_i^j + \omega_{m+1-j}^{m+1-i} = 0$, $\forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.*

Proof. By definition,

$$D_h(g) = 0.$$

is equivalent to

$$0 = dg_{ij} = g(D_h \partial_{t^i}, \partial_{t^j}) + g(\partial_{t^i}, D_h \partial_{t^j}),$$

that is, to

$$\sum_k \omega_i^k g_{kj} + \sum_k \omega_j^k g_{ki} = 0.$$

Now $g_{ij} = \delta_{i+j, m+1}$ holds, so this is equivalent to

$$\omega_i^{m+1-j} + \omega_j^{m+1-i} = 0, \quad \forall i, j,$$

and changing notation, this is equivalent to

$$\omega_i^j + \omega_{m+1-j}^{m+1-i} = 0, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}. \quad \square$$

Remark 4.3. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, we can get the relation $D'(g) = 0$ in another way. In fact by Lemma 3.4, we have

$$h^{-1} = g \cdot \bar{h} \cdot g,$$

so

$$\sum_k h_{ik} \cdot \bar{h}_{m+1-k, m+1-j} = \delta_{ij}.$$

So we get

$$\sum_k \partial h_{ik} \cdot \bar{h}_{m+1-k, m+1-j} + \sum_k h_{ik} \cdot \partial \bar{h}_{m+1-k, m+1-j} = 0.$$

Now we compute ω_i^j first. we get $\forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i^j &= \sum_k \partial h_{ik} \cdot h^{kj} \\ &= \sum_{k, l, p} \partial h_{ik} \cdot g_{kl} \cdot \bar{h}_{lp} \cdot g_{pj} \\ &= \sum_{k, l} \partial h_{ik} \cdot g_{kl} \cdot \bar{h}_{l, m+1-j} \\ &= \sum_k \partial h_{ik} \cdot \bar{h}_{m+1-k, m+1-j}, \end{aligned}$$

hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{m+1-j}^{m+1-i} &= \sum_k \partial h_{m+1-j, k} \cdot \bar{h}_{m+1-k, i} \\ &= \sum_k \partial h_{m+1-j, m+1-k} \cdot \bar{h}_{ki} \\ &= \sum_k \partial \bar{h}_{m+1-k, m+1-j} \cdot h_{ik} \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\omega_i^j + \omega_{m+1-j}^{m+1-i} = 0.$$

Remark 4.4. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, we get

- (1) $m = 2$ implies that $\omega_2^1 = \omega_1^2 = 0$, $\omega_2^2 = -\omega_1^1$, so if we want to compute all ω_j^i , we just need compute ω_1^1 .
- (2) $m = 3$ implies that $\omega_3^1 = \omega_1^3 = \omega_2^2 = 0$, $\omega_2^3 = -\omega_1^2$, $\omega_3^2 = -\omega_2^1$, $\omega_3^3 = -\omega_1^1$, so if we want to compute all ω_j^i , we just need compute ω_1^1 , ω_1^2 , ω_2^1 .

Lemma 4.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, if $m = 3$, then the relation $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to the following three relations*

$$\begin{cases} \omega_1^2(\partial_{t^3}) = \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}), \\ \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) = C_{223}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) + \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{222}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}), \\ \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Because $\omega(e) = 0$, we just need to compute $\omega(\partial_{t^2})$ and $\omega(\partial_{t^3})$. From Lemma 3.45, we know that $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to $T_{jk} = T_{kj} \forall j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.

Because when $j = k$, the above relations hold automatically, so the non-trivial cases are that $j = 2, k = 3$ or $j = 3, k = 2$. However $j = 2, k = 3$ and $j = 3, k = 2$ give the same relations.

Step 1° Take $p = 3$. We have

$$T_{kj} = C_{2ik}\omega_2^3(\partial_{t^j}) + g_{ik}\omega_3^3(\partial_{t^j}) - \omega_i^{4-k}(\partial_{t^j})$$

By the relation $\omega_i^j + \omega_{3+1-j}^{3+1-i} = 0$ we have

$$T_{kj} = -C_{2ik}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^j}) - g_{ik}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^j}) - \omega_i^{4-k}(\partial_{t^j})$$

If $i = 1$, then we get

$$T_{kj}^{i=1} = -g_{k2}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^j}) - g_{k1}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^j}) - \omega_1^{4-k}(\partial_{t^j}).$$

Then $T_{23} = T_{32}$ is equivalent to

$$(4.6) \quad \omega_1^2(\partial_{t^3}) = \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}).$$

If $i = 2$, then $T_{23} = T_{32}$ is equivalent to

$$C_{222}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^3}) + \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) + \omega_2^2(\partial_{t^3}) = C_{223}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) + 0 + \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}).$$

$\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^3}) = \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2})$ and $\omega_i^{m+1-i} = 0$ hold, so

$$(4.7) \quad C_{222}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) + \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) - C_{223}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) = 0.$$

If $i = 3$, then $T_{23} = T_{32}$ is equivalent to

$$(4.8) \quad C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = 0.$$

Step 2° Take $p = 2$. we have

$$T_{kj} = C_{3ik}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^j}) - g_{ik}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^j}) - \sum_l C_{2kl}\omega_i^l(\partial_{t^j})$$

If $i = 1$, then $T_{23} = T_{32}$ is equivalent to

$$(4.9) \quad C_{222}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) + \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) - C_{223}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) = 0.$$

If $i = 2$, then $T_{23} = T_{32}$ is equivalent to

$$(4.10) \quad C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = 0.$$

If $i = 3$, then $T_{23} = T_{32}$ is equivalent to

$$(4.11) \quad C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) - C_{333}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{223}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) + C_{222}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = 0.$$

Step 3° Take $p = 1$. we have

$$T_{kj} = C_{3ik}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^j}) + C_{2ik}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^j}) - \sum_l C_{3kl}\omega_i^l(\partial_{t^j}).$$

If $i = 1$, then computing it directly we have

$$(4.12) \quad C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = 0.$$

If $i = 2$, then we have

$$(4.13) \quad C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) - C_{333}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{223}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) + C_{222}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = 0.$$

If $i = 3$, then we have

$$(4.14) \quad C_{333}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) + C_{233}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{223}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = 0.$$

So we just need five relations (4.6), (4.7), (4.8), (4.11) and (4.14), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1^2(\partial_{t^3}) &= \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}), \\ C_{222}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) + \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) - C_{223}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) &= 0, \\ C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) &= 0, \\ C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) - C_{333}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{223}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) + C_{222}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) &= 0, \\ C_{333}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) + C_{233}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{223}\omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

Claim. *The relations (4.7) and (4.8) together with WDVV-equation imply the relations (4.11) and (4.14).*

In fact, $m = 3$, so WDVV-equations is just

$$(4.15) \quad (C_{223})^2 - C_{222} \cdot C_{233} - C_{333} = 0.$$

From the relation (4.7) we get

$$(4.16) \quad \omega_1^1(\partial_{t^3}) = -C_{222}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) + C_{223}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}) + \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^2}).$$

From the relation (4.8) we get

$$(4.17) \quad \omega_2^1(\partial_{t^3}) = C_{223}\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2}) - C_{233}\omega_1^2(\partial_{t^2}).$$

So computing directly we prove that relations (4.15), (4.16) and (4.17) imply relations (4.11) and (4.14). $\square$

Remark 4.18. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, if $m = 2$, then the relation $D'(\Phi) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$D'_e \partial_{t^2} = \partial_{t^2} \circ D'_e e.$$

From $D'(\Phi) = 0$ and $D'_e e = 0$, we have $\omega_1^1(e) = 0$, i.e., $eh_{ij} = 0$, $\forall i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. So computing ω_1^1 , we just need to compute $\omega_1^1(\partial_{t^2})$.

Lemma 4.19. *If $m = 2$, under the assumption of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, we have $h(a, b) = g(a, \kappa b)$, $\kappa^2 = \text{Id}$, which are equivalent to the following relations:*

$$\begin{cases} |h_{12}|^2 + h_{11}h_{22} = 1, \\ h_{11}h_{12} = 0, \\ h_{22}h_{12} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Straightforward computation. □

Remark 4.20. If h is positive, then $h_{ii} > 0$, so h is diagonal

$$h = \text{diag}(h_{11}, h_{11}^{-1}).$$

Otherwise if $h_{11} = 0$ or $h_{22} = 0$, we get

$$h_{11} = h_{22} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |h_{12}| = 1.$$

Lemma 4.21. *If $m = 3$, under the assumption of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, we have $h(a, b) = g(a, \kappa b)$, $\kappa^2 = \text{Id}$, which are equivalent to the following relations:*

$$\begin{cases} h_{11}h_{33} + h_{12}h_{32} + |h_{13}|^2 = 1, \\ 2h_{21}h_{23} + (h_{22})^2 = 1, \\ h_{11}h_{23} + h_{12}h_{22} + h_{13}h_{21} = 0, \\ 2h_{11}h_{13} + (h_{12})^2 = 0, \\ h_{12}h_{33} + h_{22}h_{23} + h_{13}h_{32} = 0, \\ 2h_{13}h_{33} + (h_{23})^2 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Straightforward computation. □

Lemma 4.22. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ is equivalent to the following relation*

$$(\mathcal{E} - \overline{\mathcal{E}})h = h \cdot A - A \cdot h,$$

where the matrix $A_{ij} = \delta_{ij}d_i$. That is

$$(\mathcal{E} - \overline{\mathcal{E}})h_{ij} = (d_j - d_i) \cdot h_{ij}, \forall i, j.$$

Proof. $\mathcal{Q} = D'_\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{E} - \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot \text{Id}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathcal{Q}(\partial_{ti}), \partial_{tj}) &= h(D'_\mathcal{E}\partial_{ti}, \partial_{tj}) - h(\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{E}\partial_{ti}, \partial_{tj}) - \frac{2-d}{2}h_{ij} \\ &= (\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h)_{ij} + d_i \cdot h_{ij} - \frac{2-d}{2}h_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\partial_{ti}, \mathcal{Q}(\partial_{tj})) &= h(\partial_{ti}, D'_\mathcal{E}(\partial_{tj})) - h(\partial_{ti}, \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{E}\partial_{tj}) - \frac{2-d}{2}h_{ij} \\ &= \overline{(\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h)_{ji}} + d_j \cdot h_{ij} - \frac{2-d}{2}h_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ means that

$$(\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h)_{ij} + d_i \cdot h_{ij} = \overline{(\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h)_{ji}} + d_j \cdot h_{ij}$$

We will simplify $\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h$ and $\overline{\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h}$ in the following

$$\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h = \mathcal{E}(h) \cdot h^{-1} \cdot h = \mathcal{E}(h).$$

So

$$\overline{\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h} = \overline{\mathcal{E}(h)} = \overline{\mathcal{E}(\bar{h})} = \overline{\mathcal{E}}(h^t).$$

Similarly, we have $\overline{(\omega(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h)_{ji}} = \overline{\mathcal{E}}(h_{ij})$.

So $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ is equivalent to

$$(\mathcal{E}(h) - \overline{\mathcal{E}}(h))_{ij} = (d_j - d_i) \cdot h_{ij} = (h \cdot A - A \cdot h)_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j. \quad \square$$

Remark 4.23. For $m = 2$, under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.8, if h is positive definite, then $h = \text{diag}(h_{11}, h_{11}^{-1})$, hence $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ is equivalent to the following relation

$$\mathcal{E}h_{11} = \overline{\mathcal{E}}h_{11}.$$

From above discussion, we know that given any Frobenius manifold $(M, g, \circ, e, \mathcal{E})$ of dimension two and an anti-linear involution κ of $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$, they defined a positive CDV-structure if and only if the following relations hold

$$\begin{cases} h = \text{diag}(h_{11}, h_{11}^{-1}), \\ h_{11} = h_{11}(t_2), \\ \overline{\partial_{t^2} \partial_{t^2} \log h_{11}} = h_{11}^2 |\partial_2^3 F|^2 - h_{11}^{-2}, \\ \mathcal{E}h_{11} = \overline{\mathcal{E}}h_{11}. \end{cases}$$

The integrability of these equations is proved by Atsushi Takahashi in [12], here “integrability” means that there exist a real analytic function h_{11} on M such that it satisfies the above equations. For $m \geq 3$, the sufficient and necessary conditions of CDV-structures simplify the equations in the definition of the structure, but it is still not easy to see the integrability of the determined equations of h .

4.2. Application to harmonic Frobenius manifolds. In this section, we exhibit a harmonic potential P (in the sense of [11]) for the $\text{CDV} \oplus$ structures given by Theorem 2.4, from which we keep the notations. Recall that P is an endomorphism of $\mathcal{T}_M^{(1,0)}$ which is in particular a solution to

$$\begin{cases} D'P = \Phi, \\ D' = \nabla - [P^\dagger, \Phi]. \end{cases}$$

We denote by (P_α^β) the matrix of P in the fixed system of canonical local coordinates, i.e.

$$Pe_\alpha = \sum_\beta P_\alpha^\beta e_\beta.$$

From Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 3.28, we deduce that the relations

$$D'_{e_\alpha} e_\beta = \nabla_{e_\alpha} e_\beta - [P^\dagger, \Phi_{e_\alpha}](e_\beta), \quad \forall \alpha, \beta$$

are equivalent to

$$(4.24) \quad P_\beta^\alpha = \frac{\overline{\eta_{\alpha\beta}}}{2|\eta_\alpha \eta_\beta|} \cdot \eta_\beta, \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta,$$

where $\eta_{\alpha\beta} := e_\alpha \eta_\beta = e_\alpha e_\beta \eta$.

By a similar computation,

$$D'_{e_\alpha}(P)(e_\beta) = \Phi_{e_\alpha} e_\beta, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta$$

are equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} e_\alpha(P_\beta^\beta) = -\delta_{\alpha\beta}, \\ e_\alpha(P_\beta^\gamma) = P_\beta^\gamma \cdot [\omega_\beta^\beta(e_\alpha) - \omega_\gamma^\gamma(e_\alpha)], \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta, \forall \gamma, \\ e_\alpha(P_\alpha^\beta) = P_\alpha^\beta \cdot [\omega_\alpha^\alpha(e_\alpha) - \omega_\beta^\beta(e_\alpha)], \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta. \end{cases}$$

So if we take the matrix of P as follows

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{cases} P_\beta^\beta = -u^\beta, \\ P_\beta^\alpha = \frac{\overline{\eta_{\alpha\beta}}}{2|\eta_\alpha \eta_\beta|} \cdot \eta_\beta, \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta. \end{cases}$$

then the endomorphism P satisfies $D'P = \Phi$ and $D' = \nabla - [P^\dagger, \Phi]$. It is easy to see this P also satisfies

$$P^* = P,$$

Set $\mathcal{V} := \nabla \mathcal{E} - \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot \text{Id}$. We will deduce the relation $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{V} + [P^\dagger, \mathcal{U}]$ in the following.

Since

$$P_{\alpha}^{\dagger\beta} = \overline{K_{\alpha\alpha}} \cdot \overline{P_{\alpha}^{\beta}} \cdot K_{\beta\beta},$$

computing the right hand side directly, we get

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{cases} P_{\beta}^{\dagger\beta} = -\overline{u^{\beta}}, \\ P_{\alpha}^{\dagger\beta} = \omega_{\beta}^{\beta}(e_{\alpha}), \quad \forall \alpha \neq \beta. \end{cases}$$

By straightforward computations, we get

$$(4.27) \quad [P^\dagger, \mathcal{U}]e_\alpha = - \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} (u^\beta - u^\alpha) \cdot \omega_\beta^\beta(e_\alpha) \cdot e_\beta = - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} (u^\beta - u^\alpha) \cdot \frac{e_\alpha \eta_\beta}{2\eta_\beta} \cdot e_\beta.$$

By a similar computation, we get

$$\nabla_{e_\alpha} \mathcal{E} = \frac{2-d}{2} \cdot e_\alpha + \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} (u^\beta - u^\alpha) \cdot \frac{e_\alpha \eta_\beta}{2\eta_\beta} \cdot e_\beta.$$

Hence we get

$$(4.28) \quad \mathcal{V}e_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} (u^\beta - u^\alpha) \cdot \frac{e_\alpha \eta_\beta}{2\eta_\beta} \cdot e_\beta.$$

By relations (4.27) and (4.28), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{V} + [P^\dagger, \mathcal{U}] = 0 = \mathcal{Q}.$$

So we have proved

Proposition 4.29. *The $CDV \oplus$ -structure constructed from Theorem 2.4 is a harmonic Frobenius manifold with the harmonic potential P given by (4.25).*

REFERENCES

1. Sergio Cecotti and Cumrun Vafa, *Topological–anti-topological fusion*, Nuclear Phys. B **367** (1991), no. 2, 359–461.
2. ———, *Exact results for supersymmetric σ models*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992), no. 7, 903–906.
3. ———, *Massive orbifolds*, Modern Phys. Lett. A **7** (1992), no. 19, 1715–1723.
4. ———, *On classification of $N = 2$ supersymmetric theories*, Comm. Math. Phys. **158** (1993), no. 3, 569–644.
5. Boris Dubrovin, *Geometry and integrability of topological-antitopological fusion*, Comm. Math. Phys. **152** (1993), no. 3, 539–564.
6. ———, *Geometry of 2D topological field theories*, Integrable systems and quantum groups (Montecatini Terme, 1993), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1620, Springer, Berlin, 1996, pp. 120–348.
7. Claus Hertling, *Frobenius manifolds and moduli spaces for singularities*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 151, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
8. ———, *tt^* geometry, Frobenius manifolds, their connections, and the construction for singularities*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **555** (2003), 77–161.
9. Yuri I. Manin, *Frobenius manifolds, quantum cohomology, and moduli spaces*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 47, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
10. Claude Sabbah, *Déformations isomonodromiques et variétés de Frobenius*, Savoirs Actuels (Les Ulis). [Current Scholarship (Les Ulis)], EDP Sciences, Les Ulis, 2002, , Mathématiques (Les Ulis). [Mathematics (Les Ulis)].
11. ———, *Universal unfoldings of Laurent polynomials and tt^* structures*, From Hodge theory to integrability and TQFT: tt^* -geometry (R. Donagi and K. Wendland, eds.), Proc. Symposia in Pure Math., vol. 78, American Math. Society, Providence, RI, 2008, pp. 1–29.

12. Atsushi Takahashi, *tt^* geometry of rank two*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2004), no. 22, 1099–1114.
13. Claire Voisin, *Hodge theory and complex algebraic geometry. I*, english ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 76, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, Translated from the French by Leila Schneps.

GUANGZHOU, CHINA

E-mail address: `ljzsailing@163.com`